Trans-Lake Washington Project
Washington State Department of Transportation
Sound Transit

MEETING SUMMARY

TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
EXECUTIVE AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES
MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND INDUSTRY, SEATTLE
JANUARY 10, 2001 — 1:00 PM TO 4:15 PM

INTRODUCTION AND AGENDA REVIEW

Aubrey Davis, Chair, Washington Transportation Commission, called the meeting to order. Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, welcomed the committee after its return from the holidays and reviewed the agenda. The purpose of the meeting was to receive updates on the first round of community design workshops and potential mitigation opportunities, and to review information and provide input relating to the definition of alternatives. The Executive Committee was also tasked to discuss and make recommendations relating to the Tunnel Feasibility Assessment. There were no changes to the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Theresa Gonzalez, Discovery Institute, read a letter from Bruce Agnew, Cascadia Project Director, urging the committee to consider several points and suggestions relating to the discussion about tunnels and other aspects of the project:

1. Consider advances in tube and tunneling design.
2. Consider neighborhood and environmental mitigation benefits, especially with regards to noise.
3. Consider that though capital costs for tunnels may be higher, maintenance costs would be lower.
4. Advanced geotechnical work on lake bottom has already been done.
5. HOT lanes offer a choice between time and money, and should be considered in conjunction with other lanes.
6. Coordinate HCT access to Seattle Center.
7. The Trans-Lake Project and the I-405 study coordination exemplifies the benefits of good coordination.

Jim Hutchinson, Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, read a joint letter signed by Bob Watt of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and Sarah Langton of the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce voicing concern over the proposed alternatives, and encouraging the study of a single general purpose (GP) lane for comparative purposes.

Alan Blackman, Chair of the Cascade Bicycle Club, read a letter signed by the Cascade Bicycle Club, the Bicycle Alliance of Washington, 1000 Friends of Washington, League of Women Voters, Seattle Community Council Federation, and the Transportation Choices Coalition, urging the committees to consider any expansion or changes on I-90 to accommodate two-way transit operations under the Trans-Lake Washington EIS for adequate public input. The letter also urged a commitment from Sound Transit and WSDOT to maintain pedestrian and bicycle access facilities, and not to compromise safety issues during changes.

Chris Leman read a letter from the Seattle Community Council Federation. The letter urged the Trans-Lake Project to be faithful to the commitment of the Trans-Lake Study Committee to review the entire trans-lake corridor, and include the I-90 corridor in the discussion for this project. The letter also recommended against a mid-lake crossing, and asked for consideration of non-structural ways to make better use of the existing bridge, rather than engage in its expansion.

Philip Grega, Seattle citizen, asked the committees to delineate a goal for the project, by which its success could be measured. Possible goals might be acknowledged in a measure of the number of people crossing the bridge, or a decrease in the delays caused by congestion. He also urged the committees to make public transport a high priority, consider parking taxes to motivate mode shifts, creation of park and rides, ride free zones, and adoption of municipal arterial HOV lanes.

The public comment period generated a brief discussion about the status of I-90. The project team was asked to prepare a status update about I-90 for the next meeting, and the discussion was tabled until then.

RESULTS OF COMMUNITY DESIGN WORKSHOPS AND POTENTIAL MITIGATION OPPORTUNITIES

Lee Pardini, Merritt and Pardini, and Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues, reviewed the input from the first round of community design workshops held in November, 2000. Amy explained that the purpose of the first round of workshops was to get a sense of values important to the community and measures of success for the project. She stressed that the community design workshops would be used to provide input and direction to the project from a community point of view, but that the community design workshops would not be decision-making forums. The corridor was divided into four areas:

- Portage Bay/Roanoke/Eastlake;
- Montlake/Laurelhurst;
- West of I-405 (Points Communities);
- East of I-405 to Redmond

Representation included residents, business people, and commuters along the corridor in each of those areas, and numbered 13-20 at each workshop. Each group of people will remain consistent through the remaining two sets of workshops. Eastlake representation was slightly lower than expected, and some people will be added to that group. Open houses were held in the evening in each area after the day-long workshop.

An iterative process will enable workshop input and results to be shared among the technical team, environmental team, and the committees.

Lee Pardini reviewed the major themes heard in each of the four areas, and characterized differing voices within each area. Lee stressed that mitigation is inseparable and indistinguishable from the definition of the alternatives. In general, the major themes emerging from this series of workshops were:

1. The project should not make things worse than the current situation. Noise is a big issue.
2. Minimize cut-through traffic congestion near the freeway and on arterials.
3. Knit communities back together, mending both real and perceived wounds along the length of the corridor.

Lee stated that community participants talked a great deal about 'lids'. He emphasized, however, that there were no presumptions being made for the project regarding exactly what kind of courses may be appropriate, or their potential locations. Workshop participants also understood this.

A brief summary of the major issues that evolved from the workshops follows.

Portage Bay / Roanoke / Eastlake area issues

- Awareness of and sensitivity to noise. Mitigate noise on SR 520, as well as on I-5.
- Use streets to connect communities that were historically together.
- Eliminate cut-through traffic.
- Create community center and open space in front of Seward school, possibly on top of a lid.
- Receptive to HCT modes.
- Begin a pedestrian and recreational link from Eastlake through to the Arboretum.
- Sensitivity to the hillsides and effect on traffic.
- Concern with air and water pollution.
- Aware of the limitations of lids; sensitive to landscape not being flat; consider lids that fit in and around freeway features.
- Sensitive to the Portage Bay viaduct being a visual feature, but also a source of noise; Presented with idea of using cables on a bridge to attach transparent acoustic panels to control noise.

Montlake / Laurelhurst

- Recreational and pedestrian issues.
- Restore historic Olmstead park.
- Receptive to building on a lid at Montlake such as library. A community center is already available, and space at that center should not be affected.
- Don't compete with the existing commercial center.
- More interested in open space than a town center.
- Remove unused ramps in Arboretum.
- Sensitive to and concerned with notion of traffic flowing from Montlake corridor into 520.
- Receptive to HCT access at Montlake at freeway, keeping it at the lower level but providing easy access to street level.
- Support for tying into existing north-south and east-west pedestrian and bike corridors.

West of I-405 (East of lake)

- Interest in extensive lidding from Lake to Bellevue Way
- Strong opposition to creating community center on a lid.
- Aware of difficulty of soundwalls on slopes both visually and acoustically.
- Looking to soundwalls and lids to create pedestrian access; while not trying to cover scar.
- Use green space to knit community on both sides of the freeway.
- Large sensitivity to noise, especially at the lake-front.
- Interest in restoration of the creek areas.
- Support for HCT access along corridor, but only station access for these communities (no Park and Rides).
- Use construction on lids for public purposes, but not housing.

East of I-405

- Region has larger commercial and industrial uses.
- Potential for sound walls with lids.
- Preserve/enhance street connections across the freeways.
- Want more on/off ramps for access, but don't want more congestion at those points.
- North Bellevue
    - Interest in eliminating cut-through traffic;
    - Support for lids on the freeway between 148th Ave NE and West Lake Sammamish, including houses and other built uses over the top of the freeway
- Redmond
    - Don't detract from landscaping.
    - Increase pedestrian links; link with existing/planned trails.
    - Concern for noise and other community sensitivities.
    - Freeways intrude into the community via the on/off ramps. Use urban design features to make it understood that exit from a freeway results in entrance to a neighborhood.

The I-405 interchange, will require more detailed design and time for discussion.

General issues

- There were concerns about visual and construction impacts of lids.
- Enhancements to community areas might include bridges that are themed to become part of the community, as well as bricks and light fixtures.

Nona Ganz, City of Kirkland, suggested that the I-405 interchange be discussed in detail at the next workshops, since it might be a controversial topic. Richard McIver, City of Seattle, asked if sound walls for the I-5 express lanes were brought up at the Eastlake area meeting. There was a question about the outreach conducted to employers and their employees in the area.

The next workshops will be held the last week of February, 2001, followed by a third round. The second round of design workshops will review sketches of preliminary design work, and visual impacts. Each round of workshops will be followed by open houses on the east and west sides of the lake.

Pat Serie asked committee members to let the project team know of feedback they are hearing in the communities. The summary report of the first round of workshops is available on the website at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/translake/docs.htm

STATUS OF ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, discussed the alternatives being developed by the technical team, and the associated starting points and general assumptions for HCT alternatives, roadway alternatives, and for TDM/land use strategies. He emphasized that he was presenting a starting point for design work, and that there would be several iterations. Project staff are meeting weekly, and sometimes two or three times per week. The engineering and environmental teams, numbering over 50 people, are working closely together.

Commenting on the discussion of lids in the previous presentation, Jeff stated that techniques are being developed by the team to work with noise and community connectivity. Some of the ideas converge with lids, but other ways will also be investigated. Jeff reiterated that that the modal alternatives are still being

developed from the results of the first level screening, and stated that the modal alternatives will eventually be melded with other pieces to form multi-modal alternatives.

TDM / LAND USE STRATEGIES

John Perlic, Parametrix, presented the TDM and land use strategies currently under development for the project. Continuous updates will be given as the strategies are more fully developed. John reminded the committee that the Trans-Lake Study Committee recommended that the EIS evaluate an investment of substantial resources in TDM/land use measures relative to the capital cost of the project. The strategy will focus not only on trip reduction measures, but on land use policies as well.

The project is beginning meetings with local jurisdictions in the corridor to determine the feasibility of an interlocal corridor agreement to:

- Commit to trip reduction goals, milestones, and monitoring;
- Seek funding to help achieve those goals;
- Include the private sector.

Potential TDM strategies include:

- Commute trip reduction;
- Vanpools;
- Alternative transportation – newer strategies are being investigated both nationally and locally;
- Land use strategies;
- Cost and pricing – can make the other categories take a leap in effectiveness.

A complete TDM strategy will also need to make real transportation options available through corresponding complementary infrastructure investments for bicycle and pedestrian access, HOV direct access, transit centers, and local and regional transit service.

Land use actions could follow two levels of discussion:

1. Continue to look at land use as part of larger program of supporting incentives, infrastructure enhancements, and programs to reduce SOV trips.
2. Explore effect of larger changes to land use through sensitivity tests, for which information gathered for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan may be relevant.

The third major item would be Transportation System Management (TSM) to improve operating effectiveness. The focus for this component will likely be on incident management techniques.

Connie Marshall, City of Bellevue, asked about the consequences of not signing an interlocal agreement, considering that it took two years for Redmond and Bellevue to work out an agreement on a separate issue. Jeff Peacock stated that an interlocal agreement would likely take place outside of the formal EIS. John Perlic stated that it also might take the form of a less formal memorandum of agreement or memorandum of understanding.

Elizabeth Newstrum, Town of Clyde Hill, asked that the committees be presented with cost-benefit analysis of TDM measures compared against historical data. Jim McIsaac, Eastside Transportation, asked for clarification as to whether strategies would be pursued as strategies specific to 520 or as regional efforts. Maggie Fimia, Puget Sound Regional Council, suggested that the modeling tools to get better

pricing data may be made available for the project through the PSRC. She also asked if strategies could address and prevent incidents, and whether there would be cost-effective ways of reducing incidents.

Pat Serie suggested that TDM strategies be discussed further in later meetings, and a brown-bag session will be scheduled for interested committee members.

HCT ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

Jeff Peacock presented HCT alternatives and initial assumptions for modeling and design concepts. Assumptions for the possibility of HCT on 520, I-90, and the mid-lake corridors were described for lane configurations, alignments, and possible service routes. The Sound Transit Alternative Transit Technology Assessment (ATTA) is identifying candidates for Trans-Lake HCT.

Major points noted include:

- Downtown Seattle would not receive direct bus access, as it is assumed that the Sound Transit Link light rail would establish north-south trunk service through downtown on the west side of the lake.

- There was a concern raised that the radial routes anticipated on the west side would not be duplicated on the east side. Don Billen, Sound Transit, stated that service alternatives laid out are relatively pure alternatives, and that it doesn't mean that bus rapid transit or other HCT service can't be further defined. It may be difficult, however, to maintain radial routes over long distances.

- The Sound Transit position is that there is not currently enough capacity on the 520 corridor for buses. It was mentioned that federal financing for HCT on the eastside may not be available until 2015. Jack Crawford, Sound Transit, countered that though funding is still pending voter approval, sub-area funds available on the eastside may total as much as $136 million plus matching and federal money.

Written comments are encouraged regarding the HCT alternatives. Information on modeling for HCT will be available at later meetings, and a brown-bag session will be scheduled to discuss them further with interested committee members.

HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

Jeff Peacock then reviewed the highway alternatives and assumptions along each section of an arterial photograph of the corridor.

Minimum Footprint

The minimum footprint alternative would be designed so that there was no option of adding a third lane.

HOV lanes

From Redmond to I-405, the HOV lanes would be moved to the inside of the facility, and extend to SR 202, at the request of the Technical Committee. Direct HOV connections in all directions are assumed at I-405, and other places later determined to be beneficial. HOV travel into the University District would be improved. HOV termination at I-5 may be dependent on the direction of the express lanes. There is also a possibility of ending the HOV at I-5 with a merger into GP lanes feeding into I-5.

GP lanes plus HOV lanes

Eastbound GP lanes could include start from direct connections from the Fairview/Eastlake area, or begin in the Montlake area. Westbound GP lanes might combine with the Roanoke on-ramp to I-5. A wide variety of interchanges are being considered along the corridor, each with different impacts and operating characteristics. The footprint would also be wider, especially on the lake. The current assumption is that it would probably necessitate two structures on the lake, but that does not affect current performance modeling.

GP and HOV lanes at the I-405 interchange would require major reconstruction of that interchange. GP lanes would be assumed to extend to SR 202.

Jeff reminded the committee that the analysis for the next several months would be using a 20-year horizon, and that the EIS itself will require a 30-year horizon. The emphasis would be to decide which combinations of modal activities will function the best together.

Bus-way

Adding a bus-only facility would look and operate much the same as the HOV facility. The same assumptions will be applied to this option as for HOV. Bus-ways as discussed include one of two options: Bus rapid transit, which uses a dedicated facility; or a paint-stripe-separated facility. This could either be in place of or in addition to an HOV lane.

Bike and pedestrian access

Bike and pedestrian access and connectivity are assumed throughout the length of the corridor, sometimes within and sometimes outside of the right of way (ROW).

Virginia Gunby, 1000 Friends of Washington, asked for a presentation of how the assumptions on I-5, I-405, and Sound Transit fit together with the assumptions for 520.

Janet Ray, AAA Washington, stated that she thought the committee recommendation was to consider both GP and HOV lanes separately, and then combine them. Jeff Peacock stated that the language of the recommendations was that GP should be looked at only in conjunction with HOV lanes. There was lengthy discussion about whether this issue ought to be reconsidered, and the GP-lanes-only again be included as an alternative to provide a service level comparison for modeling. There was discussion about whether the Executive Committee, if it chose to do so, could revisit such decisions. It was also expressed that the committee should think carefully whether or not to revisit past milestones, and that such an action might set a dangerous precedent. The acceleration of the schedule demands that the committee be ready to make decisions and stick by them.

It was decided that it would be best if the decision was not revisited.

TUNNEL FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT

Jeff Peacock presented the results of the tunnel feasibility study along with the comments and recommendations of the Technical Committee, and the recommendations of the project team. Tunnels were examined during the Trans-Lake Study, and there were indications that tunneling would be technically challenging and very expensive. The Discovery Institute's presentations on tunnels and tubes, as well as scoping comments, have prompted the Trans-Lake Project to take a more detailed look at tunnel possibilities. The presentation outlined local considerations, tunnel concepts for crossing Lake

Washington, and preliminary cost data. Feedback from the Technical Committee would be sought prior to taking the results to the Executive Committee.

Assumptions made for this level of study and in the presentation are the following:

- For the purpose of study, alignments would be assumed to be straight across the lake, connecting points directly opposite on either side of the lake. The alignments were used to develop a profile of what a lake crossing would look like, and the depths to which tunnels or tubes would need to descend within the lake. Alignments shown on the map are fairly arbitrary, and do not represent any alignment decisions. There are no limitations to how actual alignments might look, including the possibility of touching the northern tip of Mercer Island in a mid-lake crossing.

- Tunnels outlined and characterized in the presentation only represent necessities for water crossings, and make no assumptions about land-side tunneling possibilities.

Three technologies were analyzed: 1) bored tunnels; 2) submerged sunken tunnels; and, 3) submerged floating tubes. A 1968 study of lakebed characteristics revealed 200 – 220 feet of water, with an additional 150 – 250 feet of soft sediment on the bottom of the lake. This has large impacts on the applications of tunnels to this project. Considerations for each technology and ensuing discussion points are highlighted below.

Bored Tunnels

Bored tunnels require tunneling machines through hard material to maintain the structural integrity of the tunnel. The largest bored tunnels are 50 feet in diameter. Assuming construction of eight lanes, at least two bores, and possibly a third, would be required.

- Fifty-foot diameter tunnels at depths required (~500 feet); have never been done; and a 30-foot diameter would be more reasonable.
- Layers below the soft sediment may prove problematic, especially if they are composed of glacial till.
- Bored tunnel fixed constraints include a 4.5% grade, posing difficulty for trucks and buses, connections from I-5 to I-405 only with nothing in between.
- Ventilation would require substantial structures on both sides of the lake, with at least four structures anticipated.

Sunken Submerged Tunnel

Prefabricated sunken submerged tunnel sections could be joined at the surface and sunk to the lake bottom, or sunk and then joined. A smooth bed would need to be prepared on the lake bottom, which is typically a dredged area, but could be a raised bed. The tunnel would then be covered with a protective riprap.

- Tunnel grade would need to 4.5% to get to the lake bottom, but the length of the tunnel would be much shorter.
- Transition zones would be necessary where the tunnel from the ground meets the sunken tube under water. This would likely require a coffer dam to be built to complete the work, down to a depth of 200 feet. This would present a technical challenge.
- Landside tunneling would be required, which could use either bored or cut and cover technologies.

Submerged Floating Tunnel

A floating tube would cross the lake, with the top of the tunnel at a distance below the lake surface to enable navigation. The tunnel would be anchor or pier supported. The approaches to the tunnel on the landside would be much shorter, and the grade also would be significantly more gradual. There is the possibility of creating an artificial island at the transition between the tunnel and the land-side highway.

- No floating tunnel is yet in existence, though a project in Finland is in the later stages of design.
- Though the approach to the tunnel would not need to be as long for the floating submerged tunnel, a question to consider would be the logic of submerging the water crossing without placing land-side highways underground to gain those environmental benefits.

Summary

In summary, tunnels would be expensive and risky in both cost and schedule. The three options laid out are all at the cutting edge of technology, though the project would likely be able to handle the technical challenges involved. Portals and ventilation structures for all designs would be fairly large. The environmental impacts would need to be addressed. Connections at I-5 would be difficult.

Very general cost estimates were described for each of the options, though they included only the cost of the tunnel across the lake and associated ventilation facilities. Land-side facilities were not included.

Ventilation structures for transit-only tunnels would need to be the same size to accommodate fire and other disaster possibilities. The ventilation units would not need to be running constantly, however, because of the significantly lower amounts of exhaust. General conclusions made for highway tunnels may not hold true for transit technologies, especially in terms of grade restrictions.

Pedestrian and bicycle lanes are not certainties in tunnels, because of potential space constraints as well as ventilation issues. Prefabricated solutions (sunken submerged and floating submerged tunnels) may offer more flexibility in terms of accommodating pedestrians and bicycles.

Recommendations

The project team recommended that the cross-lake tunnels in the 520 corridor be dropped from further consideration. The team felt, however, that the mid-lake tunnel still has merit as a transit tunnel. Tunnel construction will be risky and expensive, with Lake Washington options at the cutting edge of technology. Portal sizes and ventilations issues would also be difficult to tackle.

The Technical Committee had discussed the options in detail. There was strong consensus that the bored and submerged sunken tunnel should be dropped from consideration. There was fairly strong consensus that the submerged floating tunnel should also not be considered further. However, there were also some opinions that the mitigation potential of that option is a reason to continue to consider it for the 520 corridor.

Dan Becker, City of Medina, stated that the proposed alignment for a mid-lake crossing would cross at depths of about 400 feet. He stated that the sunken submerged tunnel should still be considered in the 520 corridor for HOV and/or HCT, but that there was no reason to push an alignment further south.

Connie Marshall noted that Washington State was a pioneer of floating bridges 30 years ago. There might be other floating submerged tunnels in existence by the time a Lake Washington tunnel is built.

Kingsley Joneson, Portage Bay/Roanoke, noted that cost information presented at the design workshops approached about $6 billion for a new floating bridge, including mitigation. The no-action alternative, on the other hand, would cost about $1 billion for replacement of the pontoons and seismic replacements of the approach bridges.

John Okamoto, WSDOT, asked for clarification on why the floating submerged tunnel should remain under consideration, and how the decision might be framed by the modeling. Jeff Peacock stated that the team was still in the process of investigating how that would work. The mid-lake crossing for HCT would still be under consideration because HCT can handle steeper grades, mitigation may be less of a factor, and ventilation requirements will not be as significant. The bored tunnel for a mid-lake crossing also remains a possibility.

It was noted that floating submerged tunnels would require significant amounts of cut-and-cover tunneling, which would have significant impacts during construction, especially at the shoreline.

There was consensus among the Executive Committee members to drop bored and sunken submerged tunnels from further consideration. Jeff Peacock stated that more information on the mid-lake crossing potential, modeling data, and ridership data, will be available in the next 1-2 months. The Executive Committee asked to postpone a decision until such time that more data was available to make an informed decision about the feasibility of pursuing floating submerged tunnels. The project team will not continue further design or feasibility work on tunnels until modeling data supports such work.

Consensus on tunnels at the end of the meeting is outlined in the following table.

	Roadway options	HCT options
Bored tunnels	Dropped from consideration.	Still under consideration.
Sunken submerged tunnels	Dropped from consideration.	Dropped from consideration.
Floating submerged tunnels	Still under consideration; no work planned.	Still under consideration.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE, ACTION ITEMS

Pat Serie reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule. Modeling results will begin to be available in February, and will be presented to the committees as they are completed. A decision by the Executive Committee on the modal alternatives is expected on April 25, 2001.

Meeting adjourned.

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Overview of November 2000 Community Design Workshops (presentation)
- Alternatives Definition – Defining a Transportation Demand Management and Land Use Strategy (presentation)
- High Capacity Transit Alternatives (presentation)
- Tunnel Feasibility Assessment, January 10, 2001 (presentation)
- Email from Henry Paulman, TRUST to Executive and Advisory Committees, January 9, 2001
- Meeting Schedule

Public Comments

- Letter from Bruce Agnew, Cascadia Project, Discovery Institute, January 10, 2001
- Comments from Al Rasmussen, 3 January 2001
- Letter from Bob Watt, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and Sarah Langton, Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, January 9, 2001
- Letter from Stephen Lundgren, Seattle Community Council Federation, January 8, 2001
- Joint letter from 1000 Friends of Washington, Bicycle Alliance of Washington, Cascade Bicycle Club, League of Women Voters of Seattle, Seattle Community Council Federation, Transportation Choices Coalition

ACTION ITEMS

- Coordinate with downtown Kirkland transit study
- Sound Transit and WSDOT prepare a summary/update on the I-90 study and its implications to the Trans-Lake Project.
- Determine new participants for CDWs as needed.
- Distribute information sheets on the roadway project alternatives and assumptions, including clarification of the GP/HOV alternative that passed, and assumptions for I-5 and I-405 for system integration.
- Distribute times and locations of February CDWs to all committees.
- Schedule brown bags on HCT and TDM.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Executive Committee Members

Present	**Name**		**Organization**
X	Becker	Daniel	City of Medina
X	Berry	Jeanne	Town of Yarrow Point
X	Cairns	Bryan	City of Mercer Island
	Conlin	Richard	City of Seattle
X	Crawford	Jack	Sound Transit Board
X	Davis	Aubrey	Washington Transportation Commission
	Earling	Dave	Sound Transit Board
	Edwards	Bob	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Fong	Gene	Federal Highway Administration
X	Ganz	Nona	City of Kirkland
	Gehrke	Linda	Federal Transit Administration
	Grigsby	Daryl	City of Seattle
	Horn	Jim	Washington State Senate
	Ives	Rosemarie	City of Redmond
	Jacobsen	Ken	Washington State Senate
X	Marshall	Connie	City of Bellevue
X	Martin	George	City of Clyde Hill
X	McConkey	Fred	Town of Hunts Point
X	McIver	Richard	City of Seattle
X	McKenna	Rob	King County Council

	Murray	Ed	WA State House of Representatives
X	Noble	Phil	City of Bellevue
X	Okamoto	John	WSDOT - NW Region
	Pflug	Cheryl	WA State House of Representatives
	Sullivan	Cynthia	King County Council
	Taniguchi	Harold	King County Department of Transportation
	Wills	Heidi	City of Seattle

Executive Committee Alternates

Present	**Name**		**Organization**
	Asher	David	City of Kirkland
	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Drais	Dan	FTA
	Carpenter	Trish	Town of Hunts Point
	Creighton	Mike	City of Bellevue
X	Demitriades	Paul	City of Medina
	Dye	Dave	WSDOT - NW Region
X	Fimia	Maggi	Puget Sound Regional Council / King County Council
	Hague	Jane	King County Council
	Hughes	Gary	Federal Highway Administration
	Jahncke	El	City of Mercer Island
	Kargianis	George	Washington Transportation Commission
X	Paine	Thomas	City of Redmond
	Rourke	Philip	City of Clyde Hill
	Rutledge	Steve	City of Yarrow Point
X	Switaj	Ed	City of Seattle
	White	Bob	Sound Transit

Advisory Committee Members

Present		
X	Jean	Amick
X	Deborah	Andrews
	Hans	Aschenbach
	Allison	Beltz
X	Barbara	Culp
X	Bob	Dent
X	Bertha	Eades
	Dan	Gatchet
X	Virginia	Gunby
	Mark	Hallenbeck
X	Fred	Hart
	Jim	Hill
X	Gregory	Hill
X	Linda	Holman

	Peter	Hurley
X	Kingsley	Joneson
	Jean	Leed
X	Jim	MacIsaac
	Kirk	McKinley
X	Elizabeth	Newstrum
	Nina	Odell
X	Janet	Ray
X	Jim	Reckers
X	John	Resha
	Ronald	Sheck
X	Claudia	Stelle
X	Bob	Tate
	Tom	Tochterman
X	Eugene	Wasserman
X	Mark	Weed
X	Rich	White
X	Roland	White
	John	Wyble

Other attendees:

John Maloof, Laurelhurst
Jonathan Dubman, Montlake Community Club
Steve Gorcester, King County Council
Philip Grega, Seattle
Kay Clark
Jim Hutchinson, Bellevue Chamber of Commerce
Steve Aisaka, HDR
Teresa Gonzales,
Dan Patsak
Jim Kearnes, Montlake Community Club
Rich Tharster
Mark Stewart, Huckell/Weinman Associates
Al Rasmussesn
Andrew Schmid, King County Council
Russ Amick, Laurelhurst
Clarissa Easton, Montlake Community Club

Project Team

Rob Fellows, WSDOT
Les Rubstello, WSDOT
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
Don Billen, Sound Transit
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix

John Perlic, Parametrix
Lee Pardini, Merritt and Pardini
Cathy Strombom, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Hans Saxer, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Kimberly Farley, WSDOT
Melissa Loomis, WSDOT
Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues
Paul Hezel, EnviroIssues

PJH